

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected.

Claims 1 has been amended for clarity.

Formal Matters

Applicants warmly thank the Examiner for the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-5, except for the claim term “a vector of connect rates” as recited in claim 1.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. To wit, as noted above, the term “a vector of connect rates,” recited in claim 1, has been cited as the basis of this rejection. Applications respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted, the term “a vector of connect rates” is noted at several poitn in the present specification, but regardless of that fact, but one of skill in the art of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) would readily recognize and understand the term. As will be apparent to a person having a technical background, particularly in matrix algebra, a vector is the term used to delineate a one-dimensional array of values or variables. (See, e.g., <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=vector> (as of 4/10/06)) Thus, while Applicants respectfully submit that support can be found in the present specification, in fact, no such support within the specification is required for such a term because, at the very least, the term “a vector

of connect rates” can be (and should be) taken to mean a one-dimensional array of values/parameters that represent connect rates based on the commonly accepted understanding of the term vector.

Turning now to the term “connect rates,” Applicants again respectfully note that the values/parameters represented thereby find support in the specification, as noted in earlier Office Action responses. That being said, the term connect rates is a well-understood concept in the field of Enterprise Resource Planning, and so requires no special explication within the present specification. To wit, in the section of the specification already cited, the term “connect rates” connotes the need for a given component in the manufacture of the product in question. There being multiple components that may affect such number of producible products, a vector is used to simply and compactly represent the number of each such component. Not only is this supported by the specification (as well as the provisional application from which the present application claims priority), given the detailed (if complex) formulaic description of the use of this vector, its meaning would be quite clear to one of skill in the art, particularly in light of the present disclosure. This interpretation is corroborated by the explanations provided by many web sites having to do with Enterprise Resource Planning, which indicate the common interpretation of the term. (See, e.g., <http://lists.evolt.org/archive/Week-of-Mon-20010903/056680.html>)

Thus Applicants respectfully submit that the term “a vector of connect rates” is a well-known term in the art of Enterprise Resource Planning. Thus, not even considering the fact that this term is well defined and specifically circumscribed by the discussion provided by the present disclosure (and so find ample support therein), the available extrinsic evidence provides a

definition that corroborates and bolsters to definition respectfully espoused by the Applicants, obviate the need for the definition extant in the present specification.

For the sake of clarity and completeness, Applicants reiterate the definition provided by these sources, in noting that “a vector of connect rates” is an aggregation (a vector) of values that relate each component to the need for the component in the manufacture of the given product. Basically, “a vector of connect rates” represents the number of each component needed to produce a given number of a given product.

In light of the foregoing arguments, particularly in light of skill in the art, the term “a vector of connect rates” find ample support in the specification, and, even barring that, is known by those of skill in the art, leading to the conclusion that the term is, in the respectful opinion of the Applicants, both supported by the specification, as well as the level of one of skill in the art. This being the case, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as claimed in independent claim 1 is allowable, for the foregoing reasons. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-5, which depend from independent claim 1, are also allowable, for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5084.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 10, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants

4/10/06  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Samuel G. Campbell, III

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 42,381

Telephone: (512) 439-5084

Facsimile: (512) 439-5099